

and edited the ablest newspapers and pamphlets of the day. It had few leaders of outstanding ability and personality to interest the biographer. Furthermore the bitter partisanship of the age has in some cases passed into subsequent histories and biographies, with advantages to the Federalists. Nevertheless, the New England Republicans performed important services, both local and national, in a period full of domestic and foreign difficulties." By the skillful use of pamphlet and newspaper material, of memoirs and letters, of biographies and special histories, the author has made a clear and vivid picture of the development of the minority party, and of its determined and consistent stand from 1800 to 1815 as "essentially the party of union and nationalism."

The weakest chapters are those on "republicanism and religious liberty," and on "the national significance of New England republicanism." Here the canvas is too small; the picture lacks perspective and high lights. Nevertheless some historian writing the history of New England will find in this essay ready to his hand a scholarly monograph on one important phase of his subject.

LOIS KIMBALL MATHEWS.

University of Wisconsin.

The Government of the Philippine Islands: Its Development and Fundamentals. By GEORGE A. MALCOLM, Professor of Public Law and Dean of the College of Law in the University of the Philippines. (Rochester, N. Y.: The Lawyers Coöperative Publishing Company. 1916.)

This work contains much valuable material for the student of Philippine government; but between the reader and his goal Professor Malcolm has interposed the most formidable obstacles. The reviewer has never held in his hand a book in which so much industry has been rendered sterile by such an amazing combination of faulty arrangement and bad English.

The volume runs to 784 pages, and it is encumbered by no less than 1666 footnotes. The extent to which the notes encroach upon the text may be gathered from two instances: on the seven pages 78 to 84 there are thirty-eight lines of text and two hundred and forty-five lines of notes; on the nine pages 472 to 480, forty-one lines of text are supported by three hundred and twenty-eight lines of notes. Although some of the footnotes serve to clarify the text, most of them are

either mere extensions of the text or substitutes for a willingness on Professor Malcolm's part to accept responsibility for any statement of fact or expression of opinion. The most amusing example of the author's need for legal support is to be found on page 629, where the author quotes the well-known lines beginning "who steals my purse steals trash." At the end of the quotation is a reference to a note which reads, "Quoted by Judge Jenkins in *Worcester v. Ocampo* (1912) 22 Phil. 42, 73." This is probably the first time any man has found it necessary to furnish a legal vindication of his right to quote Shakespeare.

One would be prepared to forgive much in Professor Malcolm's volume were it not that the dean of the College of Law in the University of the Philippines has offered his students some of the worst English we have ever seen in print—a vernacular whose only analogue is that of Hurree Chunder Muckerjee. In support of this hard saying the following quotations are offered:

"Not without regret, is Dr. Johnson's statement in the preface to his dictionary here true, which it will be remembered he said 'would in time be ended though not completed' " (preface, p. vii). "So long as the imperfections of mankind necessitate the overlordship of commands" (p. 434); "It is not only advisable but necessary to possess an understandable acquaintance of the political institutions of one's native land" (p. 24). "We need not linger to approximate exact definitions. . . ." (p. 704).

For this kind of writing it may be assumed that Professor Malcolm has drawn upon his own resources; but there are many occasions on which the printer and the proof-reader have come to his aid. Of these the most striking examples are references to "wielding" the Philippines into a nation, and to a time when commentaries on the Philippine constitution shall be "indicted."

In the preface to this volume the author says: "For a number of years, I have valiantly resisted the temptation to write a book on the Philippines." It is much to be regretted that, finally, his valor should have outrun his discretion.

ALLEYNE IRELAND.

Boston.

Political Frontiers and Boundary Making. By COL. SIR THOMAS H. HOLDICH. (London: Macmillan and Company. 1916. Pp. xi, 307.)

There is always danger when the technical expert in problems of governmental administration undertakes to enter the field of statesmanship and determine the policies upon which those problems are based. The present volume is the contribution of an expert boundary marker to the statesman's problem of determining the desirable boundary. The author has served for many years with distinction in the service of Great Britain in the determination of boundaries in India and the adjoining countries, and was a member of the Argentine-Chilean boundary commission. His concept of an ideal political boundary is in consequence influenced by his official duty of securing for his country the best strategic boundary. He believes that "the first and greatest object of a national frontier is to ensure peace and good will between contiguous peoples by putting a definite edge to the national political horizon, so as to limit unauthorized expansion and trespass," and on the basis of this thesis he undertakes to show what is the nature of a frontier which "best fulfills these conditions in practice."

It is with the major premise that most readers of the volume will be tempted to quarrel. If we have abandoned all hope of coöperation in the future between the nations now at war, if we believe that man will continue to remain "so little removed from the primitive stage" as the author now finds him to be, then we shall doubtless agree that it is necessary to separate nations "by a barrier as effective as nature and art can make it." If on the other hand we still have faith in the possibility of a future world peace based upon a better understanding of one another by the peoples of the various nations and a more complete democratic control by these same peoples over their governing agencies, then instead of making boundaries barriers of isolation we shall be ready to agree with Mr. Lyde when in his volume, *Some Frontiers of Tomorrow*, he holds that where frontiers are not clearly defined along national lines they should be assimilative, and that they should be everywhere anti-defensive, i. e., they should be identified by geographic features which tend to promote peaceful intercourse. The author, of course, is insistent upon the principle that territorial boundaries must as far as possible coincide with the wishes of the people included within them, but this principle is secondary to the creation of a barrier between state and state. Better for Roumania to abandon any claims to Bu-